

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 4 and 17 have been previously cancelled.

Claims 55-57 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. Claims 5, 6, 9 and 24 have been amended to change their dependencies from previously cancelled claim 4 to claim 1. The amendments do not add new matter.

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 18-54 are currently pending.

II. Acknowledgment of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication in the Detailed Action that claims 30 and 54 contain allowable subject matter. The claims are objected to, but would be allowed if amended into independent form. Applicants note that the Office Action Summary indicates that claim 30 is rejected and claim 17 is objected to. Applicants believe that the Detailed Action is correct and that the Office Action Summary is in error. Claim 17 has been previously cancelled and claim 30 contains the features discussed in the “reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.”

III. Telephone Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Frech for all of the courtesies extended in the telephone interview held on December 20, 2005 with Melvin Garner. The rejections of claims 1 and 31 were discussed regarding the recitation of “a viewing orientation selector for changing an orientation of the image independent of the display.” Applicants pointed out that U.S. Patent No. 6,522,722 to Morrison et al. (“Morrison”) discloses an apparatus with a vertically oriented display. Morrison’s display is designed for viewing information generated by his system from a single direction. That information would only be generated in an orientation for normal viewing. Thus, there is no motivation to supply a viewing orientation selector to the apparatus of Morrison as the information will only be provided in one orientation and the display will only be viewed from a direction that matches that orientation. Further, Applicants noted that International Patent Application No. WO 97/15213 to Hu discloses an apparatus with a horizontal display in a tabletop that is mechanically rotatable. Applicants submitted that Hu discloses that when those skilled in the art want to change the orientation of the display in a tabletop, they do it by a mechanical means, not a viewing orientation selector for rotating the image independent of the display. See also U.S. Patent No. 5,655,822 to Roberts, which shows a similar structure. Examiner Frech requested that the arguments be officially made of record and stated that he would reconsider the rejection.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, 31-53 and 55-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrison in view of Hu. The Examiner states that Morrison discloses most of the features of the claimed invention, but admits that Morrison does not disclose a wireless input

device, a keypad within the tabletop or a viewing orientation selector as currently claimed. Regarding the wireless input device, the Examiner contends that wireless input devices, such as hand held bar code readers, are old and well known. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a wireless bar code reader in the apparatus of Morrison. Regarding the viewing orientation selector, the Examiner states that electronically rotating an image on a computer monitor is old and well known. The Examiner contends that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reorient the image on the computer display of Morrison in order to 'right' a sideways image" (Detailed Action, page 3, lines 13-15).

The Examiner relies on Hu as disclosing a computer table system with a top surface having an opening therein through which a display may be seen, and also including a keyboard. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Morrison and Hu to produce the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 31 recite "a viewing orientation selector for changing an orientation of the image independent of the display." This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Morrison or Hu. Further, there would be no motivation to add this feature to the cited references.

Morrison discloses a self-service checkout terminal including a vertically oriented display 32. During operation a user views the display from a position in front of the display, indicating that an image thereon is upright. There is no indication in Morrison that the image on the display is ever sideways as indicated by the Examiner. In fact, since the Morrison system generates the images, there is no reason it would do so in such a way as to form a sideways image that would need

correcting. Thus, there is no motivation to add a viewing orientation selector to the apparatus of Morrison to “right” a sideways image as contended by the Examiner.

Hu discloses a computer table with a display incorporated therein. The display is disposed on a rotatable surface within the table, such that the display as a whole may be mechanically rotated to face a viewer seated on either side of the table. Hu does not disclose or suggest a selector for changing the orientation of the image independent of the display. Further, there would be no motivation to provide Hu’s computer table with a viewing orientation selector for changing the orientation of the image because Hu’s table provides a mechanical apparatus for rotating the entire display. There would also be no motivation to incorporate Hu’s mechanical display rotation mechanism in Morrison, since there is no need to rotate Morrison’s display.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 31 are patentable over the combination of Morrison and Hu because neither disclose nor suggest “a viewing orientation selector for changing an orientation of the image independent of the display” in the context of the other elements of these claims. In partuclar, the prior art fails to show such a selector for a display disposed within a tabletop. Claims 2, 3, 5-16 and 18-29 depend from claim 1. Claims 32-53 depend from claim 31. Claims 2, 3, 5-16, 18-29 and 32-53 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Claims 55-57 have been cancelled rendering the rejection moot with respect to these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. However, if there are any questions regarding this amendment, or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this would expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Respectfully submitted,

By Melissa

Registration No.: 26,272

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant